



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/622,884	07/18/2003	Michael A. Cosman	20947.NP	2744
75	90 05/23/2005	•	EXAM	INER
Steve M. Perry			LUU, MATTHEW	
THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP P.O. Box 1219			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Sandy, UT 84091-1219			2676	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/622,884	COSMAN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	LUU MATTHEW	2676
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tingly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 M	March 2005.	
<u> </u>	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parie Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 July 2003</u> is/are: a)		·
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in the control of	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	•
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's election filed March 7, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lancaster et al (US 2001/0027456) in view of Moore (US 2002/0145615) or Kang et al (6,266,068).

Regarding claim 1, Lancaster discloses a method for combining independent scene layers to form computer-generated environments, comprising the steps of:

constructing a terrain layer using stored terrain data (Section 30; section 31, lines 8-24; and section 40, lines 1-8);

generating a feature layer using feature layer data (Section 31, lines 16-17 "cultural data, an object library, for example, 3-D objects for natural and man-made structures"; and section 40, lines 21-23); and

combining the feature layer and the terrain layer to form a composite environment (Section 40, lines 13-23 "whereby: an x,y matrix for a surface

Art Unit: 2676

geology layer... layers; then a georegistered database of roads and other human structures in overlain whereby these surfaces and features dominate over all previous layers.")

The only difference between the disclosure of Lancaster and the claimed invention is that claim 1 requires the "feature layer data that is stored separately from the stored terrain data".

However, Moore discloses (Figs. 1 and 4) a method of combining independent scene layers to from computer-generate environments. This method generates a background image layer at step (12) and stores this background image layer independently at step (14). This method also constructs a foreground image layer at step (18) and stores this foreground image layer separately at step (34). The stored background image layer (14) and stored foreground image layer (34) are combined at step (36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of storing different image layers independently into the method for combining the terrain layer with the feature layer of Lancaster to provide a method that creates and stores image layers separately. This method also combines these separately stored image layers as a later time.

Kang et al ('068), on the other hand, also disclose (Figs 2-3) a various data sources of input image layers (204, 208 and 212), wherein the image-based layer (204) can be stored in the maps (206) separately from the video-based layer (208) stored in the maps (210). Thus, since both of Lancaster and Kang et

Art Unit: 2676

al teach the methods of combining image layers from a various data sources (Lancaster, section 7), it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use separate storing maps (206 and 210) for storing image layers of Kang et al into Lancaster's method to provide a method that combines different image layers from different data sources in mixed model types as suggested by Kang et al (Column 2, lines 46-55).

Regarding claim 2, Lancaster discloses the step of rendering the composite environment for viewing (Sections 20 and 21).

Regarding claim 3, Lancaster further teaches the step of generating a plurality of feature layers (Section 40, lines 14-28).

Regarding claim 4, Lancaster discloses (Fig. 5, step 275) the step of determining the locations of features in the feature layer in reference to the terrain layer (Section 53, the last three lines; and section 55 "Next, at step 280, the datum from the surface data file at a geographic <u>location point</u> specifies the appropriate spatial density as a percentage cover for one or more 3-D object types, such as <u>trees or buildings</u>"). The trees or buildings can be considered the as the "features" on the feature layer.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that locations of features, such as roads, buildings, or trees,

Art Unit: 2676

etc. must be specified in the composite image layers to allow a user to construct a computer-generated environments as desired by the user.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Sanz-Pastor et al (6,747,649) disclose (Figs. 2, 14 and 15) a terrain rendering method in a three-dimensional environment.

-Huber et al (6,650,326) disclose (Figs. 2-5) a map display device with multiple image layers.

-Lengyel et al (6,064,393) disclose a method for measuring the fidelity of warped image layer approximations in a real-time graphics-rendering pipeline.

-Wysocki et al (5,381,338) disclose a real time 3-D geo-referenced digital orthophotograph-based positioning, navigation, collision avoidance and decision support system.

-Daly et al (6,335,765) disclose a virtual 3-D presentation includes a 3-D background layer, a 2-D video insert layer, and a 3-D foreground layer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUU MATTHEW whose telephone number is (571) 272-7663. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BELLA MATTHEW can be reached on (571) 272-7663.

Art Unit: 2676

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Luu

MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EYAMINER

Malel L